DRAFT

24 September 1986

Questions Concerning CLAS Evaluation
8 September 1986

CATALOGING

1. How does the description of stocked items in the ITEM DEFINITION file differ from the description in the ITEM MASTER file?

2. Is there a corresponding category in the current inventory system for what MSA calls recurring items? Could stocked and recurring items be described in the same fashion?

3. Does the GENERIC description offer advantages over the current system of describing nonstandard items that are not stocked when orders are placed?

4. The example is not clear to me: Does the first entry "PRT 250 914 1 00 A" include the LSAC? If not, where is the LSAC carried in the current system?

5. What additional features, if any, would be needed in the MSA system to accommodate the Federal Stock Number as well as the LSAC?

6. Could MSA standard reports be easily modified to include the free text description if it were specifically requested? Do ICS standard reports provide for the 300-character item description?

7. Is this SHORT NAME LOOKUP feature seen as a significant advantage or is it simply a nice-to-have?

8. Why would the GENERIC description feature be used for recurring items? (See 2 above)

9. Is the cataloging of entries by cognizant offices an advantage and would it reduce the workload for Logistics?

10. Are technical offices different from cognizant offices? Who is included in each category?

General: Has the MSA manufacturing system been used by any other federal government agency for cataloging a large inventory of diverse material?

REQUISITIONS

11. Is this interface between manufacturing and purchasing embodied in the modification proposal #1 on page 35? If so, why not cross reference it?

12. Is it correct to assume that under the current system any requisition data can be changed after procurement action has been initiated?

13. How would this proposal to modify the requisition number affect the effectiveness of the current material requisition system?

14. Has there been any estimate requested or made to extend the MSA transaction code?

15. Is it possible to use a "standard default" for the customer to identify the appropriate purchasing organization? Is this the same point addressed in the final sentence on page 6 of the evaluation?

16. Is the SHORT NAME LOOKUP feature of the MSA system judged to be more efficient than the research tools available under the current system? yes.

17. Is the comment in 4A the proposal #6 on page 36 of the evaluation? yes

18 What must the link between requisition and inventory alluded to in comment 4B accomplish and why can't it be defined as yet? has been

19. Are the proposals for additional information noted in comment 4C all incoporated in the proposals listed under #2 on page 35 of the evaluation? yes

20. Does comment 4D relate directly to proposal #8 on page 36 of the evaluation? ?

2

INVENTORY

21. Is the present system of placing stock issues in process
more "automatic" than the MSA system, i.e., does "manually
allocating" mean that the item manager must take some specific
action to select a substitute stock item or release back orders when
a stock item is received?

22. Where does the item manager get the information under the
present system? Is the "Information" referred to the description of
what is already in the inventory?

23. Is it correct to assume that the track of stock by warehouse
location provided by the MSA system is an advantage over the present
system of simply tracking total quantity on hand? Yes

24. Is it possible to estimate the net effect on the Inventory
Manager's workload? Does the impact noted in 3A(1) directly relate
to the proposal #7 on page 36 of the evaluation?

25. If cognizant offices took on the work of requisitioning
replenishments, would this result in a net reduction of workload or
would it simply be a transfer of work from Logistics to the
cognizant office?

RECEIVING

26. What other purposes than receiving do the Supply Action Files serve? Is there some function served by the Supply Action Files that the MSA system cannot perform?

27. How are purchases for incorrect material detected using today's receiving process? What additional check is available?

4

DISTRIBUTION

28. Why is a hard copy document needed to track an item through distribution? Could some type of bar-code identifier be affixed to an item and the tracking be accomplished by terminal?

29. Is there some form of "indirect" tracking and, if so, what is it?

30. Isn't the system modification mentioned in comment 4B covered under proposal #2 on page 35 of the evaluation?

POLICY HIERARCHY

31. Strictly speaking, isn't this topic not a "function" of logistics activity but rather a methodological approach used by MSA to build its system? It would be clearer to me if the section were used as an introduction to show the overall philosophy of how the MSA system is designed to operate and how that compares to the present system.

32. The explanation of major differences is fine as far as it goes but it does not address all the points covered in the MSA policy hierarchy.

33. I don't understand the point of the second portion of paragraph 4A on concerns. Has it been explored with MSA whether or not a mechanism could be developed to link a number of addresses and even names to a single vendor? Are there no corollary cases in the commercial world for obtaining goods from a specific branch or plant of a large corporation?

34. Is this proposal for storing multi-addresses for vendors the same as the one numbered 5 in the proposals section on page 36 of the evaluation?

PREAWARD

35. When does a buyer create a vendor quotation without first creating a Request for Quotation? Which is the more usual case in the Agency?

36. What additional capability is needed for the complex RFQs and what is the ratio of complex to non-complex?

37. How many quotations are normally received from a vendor in a single call? How are they recorded now? Are they recopied onto another form under current practice?

38. Is the proposal in Comment 4A reflected under #3 on page 35 concerning the requisition document?

39. Is the proposal in Comment 4C covered by #6 on page 36?

PREPARATION OF DOCUMENTATION

40. Why is it necessary for the Agency to be able to split the line of a requisition among different buying entities?

41. I don't understand why an original copy cannot be printed if receiving is dome before the procurement instrument is printed. What can be printed and how is it labelled?

42. Is there a net increase or decrease in the input job using the MSA vice the current method?

43. How large is the AF contract number? Why not get an estimate from MSA of the cost of making a change in the size of the procurement instrument number?

44. Why is the ability to track cost type actions an unknown at this time?

8

POSTAWARD

45. The lack of a complete history of the changes made to a procurement instrument does appear to be a significant weakness. Has a proposal been made to MSA to see what the cost would be of adding such a capability to the system?

9

VENDOR PAYMENT

46. The menus listed add to 41 vice 40.

47. Is the difference of level at which the data are collected in CONIF and the MSA system viewed as a plus or minus for the MSA system as far as Finance is concerned?

APPROVALS

48. It is not clear that hard copy is necessary for either coordination or approval is a secure password system is used instead. Also audit would not require hard copy so long as a complete history file is maintained in electronic form.

49. Again it is not clear that hard copy is required for execution of a legal purchase instrument.